

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

sized States Patent and Tradecark Office Mess, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Reg 1650

DATE MAJLED: 06-01/2004

APPLICATION NO.	PILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N
10/063,910	05/23/2002	Chris Deeg	TPM-US-PA	4400
31560 75	90 (6.09/2104		EXAMINER	
JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE			VARGOT, MATRIEU D	
7 FLOOR-1, N ROOSEVELT I	O. 100 ROAD, SECTION 2		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TAIPEL 100 TAIWAN			1732	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
000 4 4 9	10/063,910	DONG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
I CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH	Mathieu D. Vargot	1732				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIVE Generators of the right by the state of the sta	DN. R 1.138(a). In no event, however, may, in reply within the statutory minimum of ricid well apply and will expire SIX (6) & lettle, cause the application to become	y a reply be timely fixed thinly (30) days will be considered timely. EVNTHS from the making date of this communication. ABANCORIO, GSUS.C. 5, 1533.				
Status						
Responsive to communication(s) filed on _						
	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for all		atters, prosecution as to the ments is				
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 Q.G. 213,						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the applica	tion					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction as	nd/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exar	niner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abe	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	rection is required if the draw	ng(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attact	ned Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for a) All b) Some * c) None of:	elgn priority under 35 U.S.C	S. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bu						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies n	ot received.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Intervier	w Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Drafteperson's Patent Drawing Raview (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mel Daile						
Information Discresure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(e)/Mail Date	(08) 5) 1 Notice (					
S Detect and Trademark Office						

1. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant repards as the invention.

In claims 1, 8 and 15, applicant recites a step of providing a thin film and a polarizer, yet it appears that only the thin film is placed in the mold space—there is no mention of what becomes of the polarizer or howlif same is incorporated into the finished article. The specification suggests that the polarizer is in fact, or can be, the thin film. The claims require darification as to the recitation of the polarizer. In claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 18 and 19, the language "type" referring to the injection machine is superfluous and should be deleted. Also, what is a "lying type injection machine" as set forth in claims 6, 12 and 18? Applicant is requested to point out the differences between a standing and lying machine in that such terminology is certainly not conventional. In claims 4 and 11, applicant defines the injecting step as including compression molding. This is indefinite in that compression molding defines how the material is molded once in the mold, not how it is injected. Perhaps a better way of saying it is —wherein the mold includes an injection mold, a compression mold and an injection compression mold—

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior at a res such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negative by the manner in which the invention was made. Art Unit: 1732

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi et al. (see 109 in Figs. 7 and 8b; col. 9, lines 29-44; col. 10, lines 31-49) in view of the admitted prior art as shown in instant Figures 1 and 2.

Higuchi et al discloses the basic claimed method of integrally forming a light guide board and optical thin film by disposing the thin film in first space of an injection mold and injecting a light guide material into a second space of the mold, the primary reference at best lacking a showing of employing a polarizer. Note that Higuchi et al. teaches that the thin film would be multilayered and be a reflective film. However, the admitted prior art shows that it is conventional to use a polarizer in conjunction with a light guide plate and one of ordinary skill in the art would have found such an obvious modification to the process of the primary reference in order to form a lightquide plate which allows certain plane-polarized waves to be transmitted while others are reflected. This is rather conventional in the art. Higuchi et al uses an injection molding machine which presumably is standing. However, it certainly would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ whichever injection molding machine was deemed desirable to make the finished product (ie, lying or standing).

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Colaianni, can be reached on 571 272-1196. The fax phone

Application/Control Number: 10/063,910

Art Unit: 1732

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vayet

M. Vargot May 26, 2004 Mathieu D. Vargot Primary Examiner Art Unit 1732 \$\int\_2(\right\overline{o}\right\right)\$